



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

outrages upon him. Hopeful omens are that the economic forces which seemed for slavery are against race prejudice, the still considerable industrial freedom of the negro in the south, the educational reforms which mean better things for both races, and the fact that a limited suffrage will be a stimulus to attainment, if administered in good faith.

Of specific issues, the author thinks the proposed reduction of southern representation in congress constitutional under the Fourteenth Amendment, but having nothing else in its favor; he urges a Federal grant for southern education, and advises the recognition of individual fitness for social fellowship as the better alternative for the social color-line.

Springfield, Mo.

H. PAUL DOUGLASS.

Meyer, Hugo R. *Municipal Ownership in Great Britain.* Pp. xii, 340.

Price, \$1.50. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1906.

Professor Meyer of the University of Chicago has not given us much information about the subject covered by the title of his suggestive book, but has devoted the major portion of his space to establish the conclusions that cities should not have even the partial rights in granting and controlling public service corporations accorded in Great Britain, and that franchises of the long period of 42 years conceded in electric light since 1888 are not as good for the people as the far longer or perpetual franchises that obtain in some of our states. Such an onslaught on home rule and short term franchises such as the National Municipal League and nearly all municipal reformers now favor whether believers in municipal ownership or not, is quite staggering. The whole matter is thus summed up in the closing chapter: "The doctrine that the public service industries which use the public streets differ essentially from ordinary trading and manufacturing ventures and that they should be subjected to special limitations and special taxation designed to secure to the public at large a share in their profits, has permanently paralyzed every public service industry to which it has been applied." In establishing this thesis most of the chapters are devoted to an historical review of legislation along these lines in Great Britain and to many comparisons of the greater development of electric light and street railways per capita in America. Although some space is devoted to gas where municipal ownership has prevailed far longer and has had for this and other reasons far better chance on a large scale to show its tendencies in England and Scotland, yet very curiously the author omits all comparisons between per capita sales of gas there and here. Such omission is all the more interesting in view of the larger sales per capita abroad than with us.

The use of electricity in America and its effect on our other industries and on international competition would have been far more effectively treated by one who was trying to show it all to be a result of unlimited, uncontrolled franchises if the German situation had been omitted. On page 198 he says, "The cities of Germany, in part under the influence of the example of British legislation, also adopted the policy of bartering in electric lighting franchises. The result was that German private enterprise was excluded

from the field of public electric lighting while that industry was in the formative period." This taken in conjunction with the rest of the argument would lead one to expect that Germany would be cited as a very backward country electrically, from whom Great Britain has nothing to fear. On page 304, however, we are told "Precisely in so far as Great Britain's supply of cheap electric current is inferior to that of Germany," where be it remembered "German private enterprise is excluded from the field of public electric lighting, just so far is Great Britain handicapped in producing the aforesaid products of industry;" pure copper and aluminum, caustic soda, bleaching powder and electrical apparatus and machinery, "for the purpose of sale in the world's markets. Again, in Germany the belt and shaft are rapidly disappearing from the factories and machine tools, looms, etc., are being driven by separate electric motors. All of these things tell in the struggle between England and Germany in the world's markets."

In this connection it may be suggested that a large part of the electric power used in American manufacturing establishments is not at all derived from public service corporations, but is generated directly by the users.

Much is made of the graded tramway fares in the municipal plants of Great Britain as the great obstacle to a healthful scattering of the population in suburbs, but there is nowhere a statement that graded fares originated in private ownership and that the whole tendency of city ownership has been to a great enlargement of the zones and reduction of fares, which are big steps in the direction of easier access to the suburbs. Dublin and Bristol are described as showing the advantages today of private street railways, but the fact that they also have graded fares is not mentioned. The habits of the people, the exemption of idle land from taxation and other causes of overcrowding in the English cities are scarcely touched upon.

We are told that through lack of the right to purchase gas works at their structural value at the expiration of a definite term of years cities have been forced to pay large amounts in excess of structural value. In the 77 cases of municipal purchase from 1844 to 1903 where the facts appear to be known the cities according to Professor Meyer paid, in 35 per cent of the cases, from \$150 to \$193 for every \$100 invested, and in 52 per cent of the cases from \$200 to \$272, while on buying out the electric lighting company before the expiration of the franchise Birmingham paid \$2,100,000 for a \$1,095,000 investment in the plant, Liverpool \$2,000,000 for \$1,250,000 and Sheffield \$218 for every \$100 investment.

It would not seem as though private capital had much ground to complain or that the British cities realizing the large possibilities in electricity, are to be blamed for having Parliament so word grants to private electric light and tramway companies as to render purchase possible on the basis of structural values at the end of 21 or 42 years.

Professor Meyer, however, has undoubtedly struck the weakest point in all limited franchises when he holds that any restriction on a private company may lessen the flow of capital into it, yet he surely would have government surround it with the greatest restriction conceivable, namely,

prohibit rival companies entering the field. If he would not do this, a practical monopoly would any way soon result after considerable duplication of plant and over capitalization. If the government either created the monopoly or left it to create itself and undertook no regulation more than in private business and provided for no method of city purchase within the life of the existing generation at the structural value or at a small advance above such value, it is probable that in some cases, as Professor Meyer believes, there would be greater enterprise and development than with any sort of regulation. In other cases a company secure of a monopoly would become unprogressive, but the possibilities of high charges and of monopoly profit on the part of such an unregulated public service industry are so much impressed upon our people that the only practical question before us is efficient regulation or ownership. In the solution of this we get little help from our author. The effect of municipal ownership in improving wages, hours of labor, etc., is hardly mentioned. The immediate financial profits of municipal ownership appear to be conceded. We are told that in 1898-9 "all but forty-eight of the 222 municipal gas plants of the United Kingdom paid the interest and sinking fund payments properly chargeable against them," and that the average receipts and consequently the charges were only six-sevenths as much per thousand feet as by the private companies, although this better showing may be due, it is suggested, to the municipal plants serving more populous centres. The difference, however, in average size is not great.

In electric light and street railways it is not claimed that private ownership in Great Britain has proved as profitable to the community as has municipal ownership, although it is contended by Professor Meyer and probably with truth, that outside of gas private management has been more handicapped than municipal ownership by franchises of twenty-one to forty-two years.

One of the advantages always claimed by the friends of municipal ownership is that it can count on perpetual life. The public does not dare to give this advantage any more to private ownership. What this work, interesting to all students of the problem, has really accomplished is to trace the history of British legislation, show its recent conscious trend toward municipal ownership and point out the much more rapid development of street railways and electric lighting in America; but unfortunately without reference to the political evils that have attended it, and without explaining the large development of electrical industries in Germany, under even greater safeguarding of franchises than in England.

An equally interesting book might be written on the greater development of sewing machines, elevators, typewriters, farm machinery, etc., in America than in Europe, though in those cases public regulation and ownership were equally absent on both continents.

But however much one may differ from the conclusions reached in this book, every student of the subject must feel indebted to the author for the clear summary and quotation which he has given of the opposing arguments urged at each stage of legislation and the changes that were made

from time to time in the laws and their execution, and for his interesting statistical comparisons between English and American developments. Unfortunately the many quotations from parliamentary and other reports and addresses are chiefly drawn from only one side of the controversy and could easily have been matched by equally weighty official statements and reports on the other side.

Cleveland, Ohio.

EDWARD W. BEMIS.

Michels, R. *Patriotismus und Ethik: Eine kritische Skizze.* Pp. 32. Price, 50 pf. Leipzig: Felix Dietrich, 1906.

Samuel Johnson's famous definition of patriotism might have served as motto for Robert Michels' *Patriotismus und Ethik*. From the point of view of a German socialist the writer subjects to a most brilliant and merciless criticism various current ideas of patriotism and fatherland. Whether the latter be conceived as place of birth and early training, as the seat of one's race, as the source of one's subsistence, as a community of interest within political limits, or simply as the state of which one is a citizen, Michels succeeds in showing that fatal absurdities and inequalities must result. To him class standards and not international boundaries are the real social line of cleavage in the modern world. Many readers, particularly on this side of the Atlantic, will not find it easy to agree with his statement that the sole factors which have formed the fatherland-state are force, war, and dynastic marriages. Nevertheless with some rearrangement and with certain citations of new material much of Michels' criticism of ordinary sentimental patriotism would be as valid applied to American as to German conditions. In concluding his study our author expresses the opinion that an ethical basis for patriotism may be found in national civilization, "not the enforced civilization of savages by means of brandy and the Bible, but rather civilization as the basis of the progress of humanity on its path to the realization of the greatest possible physical and intellectual welfare, physical and intellectual capacity for enjoyment, the greatest possible earthly welfare." This is altogether beautiful, and largely commendable, doubtless, yet if subjected to the same logical process that our author himself applies to other concepts it could readily be resolved into thin air. Reacting from extreme to extreme one is tempted to recall in this connection Senator Conkling's famous *mot* to the effect that when Doctor Johnson defined patriotism as the last refuge of a scoundrel he forgot the infinite possibilities that lurk within the word reform.

Swarthmore College.

ROBERT C. BROOKS.

Warne, Frank Julian. *The Coal Mine Workers, a Study in Labor Organizations.* Pp. x, 251. Price, \$1.00. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1905.

Few people who glibly discuss the trade union have any actual knowledge of its manner of working, or its actual purposes. The unions are often much abused and misunderstood institutions, possessing the same virtues and shortcomings as other political and commercial organizations. Dr. Warne has